

PLANNING REF : 260063
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 47
: Reeves Way, Wokingham, Berkshire
: RG41 2PS
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Krishan Verma
DATE SUBMITTED : 29/01/2026

COMMENTS:

49 REEVES WAY WOKINGHAM RG41 2PS

Application Number: 260063

PROPOSED ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION FOLLOWING
DEMOLITION OF THE EXISTING CONSERVATORY, PLUS CHANGES TO
FENESTRATION I REFER TO THE COUNCIL'S RELEVANT TERMS OF
REFERENCE/PLANNING GUIDELINES RELATING TO REAR EXTENSIONS AS
FOLLOWS:

- Wokingham Borough Council's Borough Design Guide (for any new build or extension) states "The primary consideration is impact upon neighbours".
- The Borough's Design Guide states "Rear extensions should not project more than four metres from the main wall where they are close to a side boundary".
- The Council's Residential Design Checklist states "Paragraph 2 - Do they relate well to their context, including both the existing site and neighbouring properties" and "Paragraph 24 - For proposed alterations or extensions to existing dwellings, is the proposal well designed in relation to the original building, to the neighbouring properties and to the character of the local area".
- "If any part of the extension is within 2 metres of the boundary the eaves height must not exceed 3 metres."
- Planning Material Considerations - overlooking, loss of light and overbearing impact.

Representation on Planning Application - 49 Reeves Way

From: 47 Reeves Way (Immediate Neighbour)

As the adjoining neighbour to the proposed development at 49 Reeves Way, I wish to submit the following comments and objections for consideration:

1. Impact on Appearance and Amenity from 47 Reeves Way

While I understand the applicants' desire to extend their ground floor living space, the scale and design of the proposed extension in its current form would have a significant and overbearing impact on our property.

The extension is designed with a single pitch roof sloping upwards towards the rear of 49 Reeves Way, resulting in two substantial plain brick side walls rising to just below the first floor windows. From our conservatory (used daily as a dining room and office), this would present as a large, dominant brick elevation with considerable visual bulk.

A hipped roof design incorporating three roof pitches would substantially reduce this impact. A roof that slopes inwards from both sides as well as the rear would lower the height and massing of the side wall adjacent to our boundary. This would create a more sympathetic and less intrusive appearance. It would also reflect the existing roof form of the rear extension at 16 Crail Close and the roofline of our own conservatory, resulting in a more harmonious

relationship with surrounding properties.

The proposed extension is positioned approximately 1000mm from the boundary between our properties. Given this proximity, I believe the 2 metre rule applies, requiring eaves not to exceed 3 metres in height. In addition, the proposed depth (4365mm) and width (11785mm) are excessive in this context and would significantly reduce natural light entering our conservatory. My calculations indicate a loss of approximately 82% of side light and an obstruction of 3470mm of our current view.

To mitigate this, I propose a reduction in width by 2000mm, setting the extension further away from the boundary with 47 Reeves Way. This adjustment, combined with a hipped roof, would help ensure the extension is not unreasonably overbearing.

A diagram illustrating these suggested amendments, along with a photograph showing the current light levels that would be affected, is included with the hard copy submission delivered to the Council.

2. Proposed New Side Window Overlooking 47 Reeves Way

The plans include a new full height window in the side elevation of 49 Reeves Way, directly overlooking our conservatory area. I strongly object to this element of the proposal due to the resulting loss of privacy.

If a window is deemed necessary, I request that it be either removed entirely or replaced with a high level, obscure glazed fanlight window to prevent direct overlooking.

Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above namely the overbearing scale of the extension, the significant loss of light to our conservatory, and the unacceptable overlooking from the proposed side window I must object to the application in its current form.

I do not believe the amendments I have suggested are unreasonable, and I hope they will be given full consideration.

A diagram and photograph supporting these comments are attached to the hard copy version of this submission.